

1961

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

8199

United States with Cuba's military power. We have bases on the border of the Soviet Union. We have missile bases and air bases on the border of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union is not likely to say tomorrow, "We are going to go to war." When that is said, there may be a few more pale faces around this place.

That will be a sad day. The tractors which are being talked about now will not mean the difference between life and death to this republic. Czechoslovakia has tractors; and they work. Russia has tractors; and they work. The Russians know how to deliver them. They have delivered tanks and MIG's; they will be able to deliver tractors. Let us not buy this buncombe, this demagogic argument.

Mr. Castro tried to make political propaganda and put us on the spot. He thought we would say no. He thought we would say no, and then his firing squad would go to work. He thought the men who have been sent to America would not get tractors in exchange for lives.

We have called his cynical bluff through some humane American citizens. Eleanor Roosevelt needs no defense in this body. Walter Reuther is a great American and a great leader. Dr. Milton Eisenhower is the brother of the former President of the United States and a distinguished American. These great people did not need to be coached by anybody. They are good Americans. Their patriotism is beyond contest. I do not believe they are engaged in helping Castro to build missile bases. I do not believe they are engaged in a game of blackmail. I know they are not Communists. They are patriotic, dedicated, God-fearing, God-loving, people-loving Americans.

The President of the United States has some help in this body. We are not about to run when someone rises and yells "Communists, Communists; Castro, Castro; blackmail, blackmail."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I had not intended to take part in this discussion because I have another matter I wish to mention. However, in view of the fact that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] issued a public challenge to anyone who would stand up and defend the President of the United States, I cannot refrain from declaring where I stand. I stand behind the President of the United States.

As one goes along in life, one becomes more and more convinced that the presumption is always on the side of mercy, compassion, and helpfulness. Sometimes excessive mercy may lead one astray; but the overriding principle always should be to try to save life, to try to reduce cruelty, to try to reduce pain. That is the proper course. The people who instinctively respond and try to help people are, to my mind, the best Christians and have, in the long run, the most constructive influence.

I am very glad that these three American citizens took up the cause of trying to save the lives of more than 1,200 men. I am very glad the President of the United States encouraged them. We should be proud of these people. I think

that when the Senator from Indiana and other Senators read the text of their remarks—and I hope they will not be changed—they will be somewhat ashamed of what they said tonight.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I should like to know what the able Senator from Illinois means by his statement that he hopes the remarks will not be changed. I think that is a reflection upon the integrity of another Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Indiana well knows that upon occasion there has been an exchange of personalities between the Senator from Indiana and other Members of this body, and that the Senator from Indiana has then proposed that the exchanges be expunged. He knows that. That occurred once in my own case; it also occurred in connection with a colloquy between the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Indiana.

I do not wish to be led into a diversion. What I am saying, fundamentally, is that we should not be ashamed of being merciful, and we should defend those who are merciful.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. My observation has been—and I shall say this as unemotionally as I can—that during the past 30 years those who have taken such a position toward communism throughout the world have failed. We have lost lives in Korea; we are now indulging in a cold war; we know that the head of the Soviet Communist Government has told us he will destroy us and that our grandchildren will live under communism. Yet every day in the Senate Members say that we must do certain things, such as the action which is now proposed, in order to stop communism; if we do not, it will destroy America.

When will we get to the point where we will quit listening to those who have been appeasers over the years; those who made the Yalta and Teheran Agreement; and those who were responsible for recognizing Soviet Russia in 1933, as President Roosevelt did? At that time, he was fearful that Russia would not keep its word, so he had them write a letter—and to what avail?

I, for one, will not listen any more to the appeasers. I will not listen any more to those who tell us we must be soft and must do this and the other thing; that we have to be kind to those who tell the American people to their teeth that they will be destroyed. I am not about to give Mr. Castro, Mr. Khrushchev's puppet in Cuba, 500 tractors to build construction projects to destroy America. The Senator from Illinois can do it if he wants, but I will not.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Indiana is a master of confusion.

Mr. CAPEHART. I was under the impression that what I said was very direct and to the point. I did not intend to mince any words.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Indiana is a master of confusion. He is trying to say that anyone who attempts to save 1,200 lives is thereby appeasing

communism. No such thing. As a matter of fact, in the Civil War—and the incident came up again and again—Lincoln was asked to shoot Confederate prisoners because certain atrocities had been committed against Union soldiers in the South. Great pressure was brought to bear upon Lincoln to shoot Confederate soldiers in reprisal, as a means of getting an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. But Lincoln refused to do so. After the passage of almost 100 years, we realize that Lincoln was right and that those who urged that he adopt a policy of vengeance were wrong. Similarly in this matter, I see nothing wrong in trying to save 1,240 lives.

That is all I wish to say on this subject. I do not believe the people who have formed the committee and the President should be subjected to the attack and the scorn which the Senator from Indiana has heaped upon them. As I have said, I had not intended to get into the dispute; but since I was here and since the Senator from Indiana laid down an open challenge to anyone who supported the President to get up and defend him, I felt that if I did not rise and speak these few words, I would be regarded, by implication, as not defending the President and not defending the committee.

May 24

As I said in 1956:

I do not believe the American people can permanently postpone dealing with this issue.

But, Mr. President, we, here in this quiet and, as I said, sometimes pleasant club have postponed dealing with this issue. The consequences are that many Negro Americans are now asserting their right to live as equals under the Constitution by nonviolent action.

As Mr. Lippmann said yesterday, and as I inferred in 1956, the fault lies not only with the laws and the practices of a particular State or community; it lies also with us who have refused to act, who have delayed and postponed, and who have been unable because of the rules of the Senate and the nature of our institution to come to grips with this problem.

I claim no gift of omniscience for having said then that the kinds of events which are happening today would take place if we failed to do our duty. To my mind this was clear for all to see. But the events of the present make it even more important that we act soon to guarantee the rights of all of our citizens to the equal protection of the laws, for time is running out and the future may end in disaster if we fail to do so.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from a statement I made on the Senate floor on July 25

a civil rights measure of any real substance to a vote in this body. Pale imitations may be offered by the political leaders to clear their skirts but it has now been demonstrated that no real improvement can be made.

I think the course which the Senate has followed will probably prevent the American people, in a legislative fashion, from ever proceeding to defend the rights of the Negro minority in this country.

I say that with great sadness, but I think it is a fact. Many persons may exult over this tendency. I do not.

I say that great wrongs are perpetrated upon the Negroes of this country, in all sections of the country. Sometimes those wrongs are perpetrated legally. Sometimes they are perpetrated outside the law, by the coercion exercised upon Negroes to prevent them from voting, and in various other ways. They are discriminated against in employment and in housing. They are discriminated against so far as schooling is concerned. They are discriminated against in voting which frequently they can only do at the peril of their lives. They are not assured of a fair trial and frequently do not receive it. I regard all this as a great blot upon the American people, and as unworthy of the ideals upon which this Republic was founded. It is in the deepest sense of the term un-Christian.

I want to say that the Senate of the United States, along with all the other matters with which it has to deal, has in this matter a heavy burden upon its conscience.

I think as a result of the disillusioning experience we have gone through that practically there is very little we can do. The Negroes of this Nation are subjected, in many quarters, to great economic and physical pressure and are deprived of their basic rights under the Constitution. The rules of the Senate are so devised that we cannot act to defend them, and thus our legislative action in their protection will be almost impossible.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not believe the American people can permanently postpone dealing with this issue. But the Members of the Senate who are in this quiet, and at times pleasant, club cannot hope to escape the scrutiny of the public opinion, not only of this country, but of the world.

I have probably not been very skillful in the efforts which I have made to bring this matter to a vote. I have tried my best but I know that at on at least two occasions I have been outwitted by the very able field generals on the opposing side. I make no protestations of personal virtue. I believe we must seek to right the great wrongs we have inflicted upon the Negro people if we are to escape the judgment of a just God. I do not question the motives of those, however, who have taken a contrary position. I merely say this is an issue which will weigh not only upon the conscience of the country, but upon the conscience of the Senate.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 27, 1956]

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, as this legislative wail is at last permitted to enter the parliamentary halls when it is too late for it to have any future, its dying eyes can perhaps look up at the walls of the Senate and see the otherwise invisible but no less real inscription which men have placed there for all civil-right measures: "Abandon hope all ye who enter here."

For how much longer will the Senate and the country permit manmade rules to prevent us from even considering measures which the vast majority of the people

## NBC WHITE PAPER ON THE RAILROADS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, last night a great many people undoubtedly saw NBC's white paper on the railroad problem. In response to this first major attempt on the part of television to deal with a critical national problem, I hesitate to make any comments that might be construed as critical of the program. It was, after all, probably the first time was many people have been given a glimpse of a problem that threatens to affect us very seriously in both our pocketbooks and our standards of urban living.

There are several points which I should like to make on the program, because it touches on legislation I have introduced, and I want to make sure that there is no confusion about the purposes of this legislation.

First, the NBC show dealt at length with the national shrinkage of railroad passenger travel under the impact of the automobile and the airplane. The show carried us back to the heyday of railroad travel, the glamour of riding the 20th Century Limited from New York to Chicago, and contrasted that bygone era with the often unglamorous, uncomfortable, and inconvenient intercity railroad passenger service being provided today.

It is extremely important, in my view, that the problem of intercity passenger service be separated from the problem of urban commuter service.

While there may be question as to the need for intercity railroad passenger service, there can be no question about the continuing and growing need to maintain and improve the urban mass transportation service now being provided, generally at a loss, by the railroads.

I do not know of any transportation expert who would disagree with that general proposition.

Yet time and again people confuse the two problems, and conclude that because the need for one service is declining, neither service is worth preserving.

This attitude is often compounded by a superficial interpretation of the statistics on the number of people being served by the commuter railroads in the urban areas.

In New Jersey, only about 75,000 people use the railroads to get to work in New York, out of a total population of 4½ million people living in the northern New Jersey region. Why should the public spend substantial sums of money to serve the pleasure and convenience of a relatively small proportion of the population?

The answer is that the pleasure and convenience of these people are not the primary issue. The issue is the consequence to the economic viability of the entire New York region if these rail commuters are forced into their automobiles for the journey to work because the railroads are financially unable to provide the service. It does not take much to contemplate what the consequences would be if 75,000 or even

**CASTRO, CUBANS, AND TRACTORS**

**MR. FELL.** Mr. President, I, too, rise to join those who support the President. I wish to be counted among those who support him. I do so with perhaps some temerity, in view of the lucidity of the remarks of my more senior colleagues, but I feel called upon to comment on Castro's offer to return 1,240 prisoners for 500 tractors.

This offer has, understandably, caused mixed emotions—blackmail, ransom, or what one wishes to call it, it is distasteful. On balance, though, I rise today in support of the efforts to raise funds for the tractors, efforts which have received the blessings of our President, on whose shoulders falls the primary responsibility for the conduct of our foreign affairs.

First. From a positive viewpoint, the response of American citizens to the plight of our Cuban brothers has once again stressed the concern of us Americans, of a democracy like ours, with individual human lives. This is where the Communists show themselves in their true colors. Human life to them is instrumental to the attainment of their ends, and human beings merely serve the government to further its aggrandizement and power. With us, the Government serves the individual, and human lives are treated dearly.

Second. The whiplash of world public opinion has already caught up with Castro's shortsighted and stupid gesture in launching this idea in the first place.

I quote from some newspaper articles recently published in Latin America.

The newspaper *La Capital*, in Argentina, stated:

The incredible proposition has again shaken the free world with its brutality and utilitarianism, freed of any human feeling.

The famous newspaper *La Presna*, of Buenos Aires, stated:

In Cuba there are no gas chambers in use, but they have been replaced with the execution wall.

In Brazil the *Diario Carioca*, a leading liberal daily, stated:

The ransom operation now being negotiated in Washington reveals in all its hid-

deness the inhuman nature of the Cuban revolution.

Also in Rio de Janeiro, *O Globo* stated: "He wanted to trade Jews for trucks but Castro wants to trade Cubans for tractors. It may be that this shows progress or superiority of communism, or 'socialism'—as the Cuban regime prefers to be called in order to create confusion—over nazism, but we can't see any."

In addition, Mr. President, the front pages of many newspapers in Latin America are themselves launching appeals for tractors to release the Cuban freedom fighters. And, in doing this, they underline the crass materialism of the Communists. How would it look if we, who were responsible for placing these Cuban men in their present plight, backed away from them and left the burden on our fellow Americans to the South?

In this connection there is a particular American obligation. Our country was involved in the plans of the Freedom Fighters. It seems to me that we still have an obligation to the men involved.

I was on the Hungarian border when the Hungarian Freedom Fighters streamed across there, and remember how they believed the United States bore a special responsibility for their uprising through the encouragement they had received from Radio Free Europe. American public opinion responded magnificently to help them. Even more directly in Cuba, we were responsible for an abortive uprising.

I believe that when the dust is settled on the exchange for tractors for human lives, we will have seen a mature, religious democracy taking the lead in accepting the challenge and turning the threat of a barbarous and imperialistic opponent. And the more our friends to the south of our border join with us in this effort, the more progressive and wise and humanitarian we all will show ourselves, and the more glaring and worse will be the light in which Castro finds himself.

1961

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

8277

**STOP BULLDOZERS TO COMMUNIST CASTRO**

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a House resolution which would place this House on record as opposing the shipment of any equipment to Communist Cuba. I hope this House will follow the sentiments of the majority of the American people and oppose without compromise this blackmail. With communism knocking at the door of the United States the American people are now looking to Congress to save this Nation and the Western Hemisphere from complete Communist domination.

Mr. Speaker, our people are shocked and disturbed as never before in modern history over this fantastic and unbelievable proposal to strengthen our enemy with our own money and equipment. They are shocked even further by the suggestion that those contributing to Castro's support would be guaranteed Government tax exemption for such contributions.

Our Government leaders do not learn by experience. They make the same mistakes over and over again. With our gifts of trucks and mechanized equipment we enabled Russia to occupy and hold all of central Europe in slavery. It was British and French appeasement of the raving Hitler that gave him the time to build up his bloody and ruthless war machine. Some of the countries he later attacked even loaned him money and equipment. We have helped nation after nation only to see them join Russia and her growing list of satellites. We sent Japan the scrap iron which killed thousands of our American servicemen. Bulldozers, trucks, helium, and all such material will definitely help Castro in his wild ambitions to conquer militarily and by subversion all of southern and central America. This equipment will unquestionably enable him to build airfields, military highways, missile bases, and launching ramps with which someday to hit the civilian populations of New Orleans, Mobile, Miami, Jacksonville, and other great cities. Our Government helped Castro into power. Our Government helped him strengthen his position by the weak, unsupported April 17 invasion, and now we propose to give him the military strength to advance against our Nation and our Western allies. We should prevent any group in America by any means from shipping anything to Castro that will enable him to strengthen his Communist position economically, militarily, or otherwise. I hope this House will adopt this resolution before it is too late. We cannot, we must not reward Communist blackmail.